UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,248	01/18/2001	Jason Weber	44431-233644 (13237-2750)	8161

		EXAMINER
27792 7590 05/24/2004		BLACKWELL, JAMES H

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/765,248	WEBER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James H Blackwell	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 11-13, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Courtner et al. (hereinafter Courtner, "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000,

Professional Edition", Sybex, copyright 04/1999).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Courtner teaches the Spelling feature in

Microsoft Office 2000 (p. 36; compare to Claim 1, *"A method for validating*

information in an electronic document, comprising"). Courtner also teaches

Microsoft Word 2000 will flag possibly misspelled words as you type by placing a wavy

red line underneath them (p. 36; compare to Claim 1, *"... identifying a string having a*

unique identifier associated with the string"). Courtner also teaches that to correct

possibly misspelled words, all you have to do is right-click on a flagged word to open the

Spell It shortcut menu, which lists suggestions for the proper spelling (pp. 36-37;

compare to Claim 1, *"... creating a request for information requesting information*

associated with the unique identifier"). Courtner also teaches that you can click on

the correct spelling, choose to Ignore the word, or Add the spelling to your custom

dictionary (p. 37; compare to Claim 1, *"... selecting a reference material source that*

contains the information associated with the unique identifier; accessing the

selected reference material source to obtain the information associated with the

unique identifier; and comparing the information associated with the unique

identifier to the string to determine whether the string is valid").

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Courtner also teaches that you can click on the

correct spelling (which updates the misspelled word to the correct spelling), choose to

Ignore the word, or Add the spelling to your custom dictionary (p. 37; compare to Claim

2, *"... if the information associated with the unique identifier matches the string,*

then determining that the string is valid; and otherwise, determining that the

information associated with the unique identifier updates the string").

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Courtner teaches Microsoft Word 2000 will flag

possibly misspelled words as you type by placing a wavy red line underneath them (p.

36; compare to Claim 3, *"... searching the electronic document for strings having*

unique identifiers when the electronic document is opened").

In regard to independent Claim 11, Courtner teaches the Spelling feature in

Microsoft Office 2000 (of which Microsoft Word 2000 is a part) (p. 36). Courtner also

teaches Microsoft Word 2000 will flag possibly misspelled words as you type by placing

a wavy red line underneath them (p. 36; compare to Claim 11, *"... an application*

program for creating the electronic document and creating a request for

information to obtain selected reference material; a reference engine for receiving

the request for information from the application program"). Courtner also teaches

a Spelling and Grammer dialog box. One of the options is to be able to select a

Dictionary Language from a drop-down menu (defaults to English (US)) (p. 93; Fig. 5.5;

compare to Claim 11, *"... selecting one of a plurality of reference material sources based upon the request for information"*). Courtner also teaches in the Spelling and Grammer dialog box, a window that contains possible suggestions on the proper spelling of a misspelled word, from which one can either select one of the suggestions, or ignore the misspelling, or add the word to a user dictionary (p. 93; Fig. 5.5; compare to Claim 11, *"... and accessing the selected reference material source to obtain the selected reference material; and the plurality of reference material sources for providing reference material"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Courtner teaches Microsoft Word 2000 will flag possibly misspelled words as you type by placing a wavy red line underneath them (p. 36; compare to Claim 12, *"... the electronic document includes a string having a unique identifier associated with the string, and wherein the request for information comprises the unique identifier"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Courtner teaches in the Spelling and Grammer dialog box, a window that contains possible suggestions on the proper spelling of a misspelled word, from which one can either select one of the suggestions, or ignore the misspelling, or add the word to a user dictionary (p. 93; Fig. 5.5; compare to Claim 13, *"... the application program compares the selected reference material with the string to determine whether the string is valid"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 16, Courtner teaches Microsoft Word 2000 (a word processing program) will flag possibly misspelled words as you type by placing a wavy red line underneath them (p. 36). Courtner also teaches a Spelling and Grammer dialog

box. One of the options is to be able to select a Dictionary Language from a drop-down menu (selected language for USA is English (US)) (p. 93; Fig. 5.5; compare to Claim 16, *"... the application program is a word processing program having a selected language, and wherein the request for information comprises an identifier for the selected language"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 17, Courtner teaches a Spelling and Grammer dialog box. One of the options is to be able to select a Dictionary Language from a drop-down menu (selected language for USA is English (US), and there are many other languages to choose from in a pull down list) (p. 93; Fig. 5.5; compare to Claim 17, *"... one of the plurality of reference material sources is a dictionary in a first language and another one of the plurality of reference material sources is a dictionary in a second language"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 18, Courtner teaches creating and printing envelopes and labels in Microsoft Office 2000 by using the feature that address books may be maintained and shared between applications (pp. 64-65; compare to Claim 18, *"... one of the plurality of reference material sources is an address book associated with an electronic mail application program"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 20, Courtner teaches Microsoft Word's AutoSummarize feature, a tool for generating executive summaries or abstracts of documents, automatically fills in the properties for keywords and comments (p. 275; compare to Claim 20, *"... the request for information comprises key words summarizing the content of the electronic document"*).

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Computer Concepts (hereinafter CC, downloaded from

http://www.cconcepts.co.uk/products/wordw.htm, 05/19/1997 last update to page).

In regard to independent Claim 23, CC teaches a stand-alone application that

works with all word processors and is the ideal assistant for all word processor users.

WordWorks is unique in that it includes a complete English dictionary with explanations,

and so it can be used not only for finding alternative words, but also for spell checking

and finding the meaning of words. WordWorks presents an exact on-screen

representation of the printed page of a traditional paper thesaurus and dictionary ---

including italics, highlights etc. It therefore offers the familiarity of the traditional paper

product along with the convenience and speed of the computer. It offers instantaneous

lookup of words; once you've found the word or phrase you want, simply double click on

it to transfer the selected word to your word processor or editor (this works with all

desktop word processors (p. 1 of 3; see Fig. p. 2 of 3; compare to Claim 23, *"... in*

response to a selection of a dictionary control provided by the application

program, displaying a dictionary interface on a display device; receiving a

request for a selected word; creating a request for a definition of the selected

word; based upon the request for a definition, selecting a dictionary file;

accessing the dictionary file to obtain the definition of the selected word; and

providing the definition of the selected word so that the definition is displayed in

the dictionary interface").

In regard to dependent Claim 24, Claim 24 reflects substantially similar subject

manner as claimed in Claim 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 25, Claim 25 reflects substantially similar subject

manner as claimed in Claim 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Halstead et al. (hereinafter Halstead, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,392).

In regard to independent Claim 7, Halstead teaches a method and system for

providing a flexible, sharable database with proximity searching capability is disclosed.

In one embodiment, such a system includes a database manager, a spatial indexer, and

a storage unit. The database manager receives unformatted data from a memory,

database, an interconnected network of document resources (e.g., the Internet, the

World Wide Web, etc.), etc. and processes the unformatted data into a series of records

for the database. The database manager adapts to the schema of the data. That is, the

database manager is able to receive data in any format from an interconnected network

such as the Web and place it into a database. That data may be in, for example,

row/column format, ASCII row/column format, deliminated ASCII, etc. The spatial

indexer recognizes address information in the data and generate spatial indices for

records based on the addressing information to associate a geographic location with

each of the records. In one embodiment, the spatial indexer includes an address

extractor and a geocoder. The address extractor extracts the address information from

the data, and the geocoder geocodes the addressing information (Col. 3, lines 36-56;

compare to Claim 7, *"... receiving a request for selected reference material;*

determining that an identity of a user is relevant to the selected reference

material; creating a request for information requesting the selected reference

material and identifying the user; selecting a reference material source based

upon the request for information; accessing the selected reference material

source to obtain the selected reference material; and providing the selected

reference material in a manner that is relevant to the identified user").

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Halstead teaches that the spatial indexer

recognizes address information in the data and generate spatial indices for records

based on the addressing information to associate a geographic location with each of the

records. In one embodiment, the spatial indexer includes an address extractor and a

geocoder. The address extractor extracts the address information from the data, and

the geocoder geocodes the addressing information (Col. 3, lines 50-56; compare to

Claim 8, *"... the selected reference material is a set of directions and wherein*

providing the selected reference material comprises: providing the set of

directions so that the directions begin with the identified user's location").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Courtner.

In regard to Claims 4-6, Courtner fails to teach that the *string is a name and the*

selected reference material source is an address book, or *that the string is an address*

and the selected reference material source is an address book, or the string is a value

associated with a stock symbol and the selected reference material source is a real time

stock quote. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to have had a string identifier associated with a name, address, or

stock or any other symbol linked to a site containing addresses or stock quotes or any

other information as this is a well known method used in hyperlinking parts of a

document. The benefit would have been to provide a user with direct links to specific

information pertaining to the word(s) or phrase(s) that are referenced with a hyperlink.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Halstead in view of Abrams et al. (hereinafter Abrams, U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350).

In regard to dependent Claims 9 and 10, Halstead fails to teach *the selected reference material source is one of a plurality of reference material sources, and at least one of the reference material sources is a remote server or the selected reference material source is accessed via a network*. However, Abrams teaches a means for collecting summary information from remote sources, associating each summary item (e.g., a reference item contained in a remote source web page) with a network address (i.e., a URL) which describes where the full data item can be found (Col. 2, lines 53-58; compare with Claim 9, *"... the selected reference material source is one of a plurality of reference material sources, and at least one of the reference material sources is a remote server"* and Claim 10, *"... the selected reference material source is accessed via a network"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Halstead and Abrams providing the benefit of having had access to remote data sources.

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner in view of Halstead.

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Courtner fails to teach *a user's identity is relevant to the request for information, and wherein the request for information comprises an identifier for the user*. However, Halstead teaches a flexible, web-shareable database (like an address book). An address extraction extracts addressing information (unique identifier) from the data received (address book) and supplies the addressing information to a geocoder (selected reference material source based upon

the unique identifier). The geocoder generates a geocode corresponding to the addressing information and associates the geocode with the addressing information (Col. 3, lines 36-56; compare to Claim 14, *"... a user's identity is relevant to the request for information, and wherein the request for information comprises an identifier for the user"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Courtner and Halstead providing the benefit of accessing data specific to a location over the web.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, Courtner fails to specifically teach *the request for information comprises a unique identifier associated with an entry in the address book, and wherein the reference engine selects the address book as the selected reference material source based upon the unique identifier.* However, Halstead teaches a flexible, web-shareable database (like an address book). An address extraction extracts addressing information (unique identifier) from the data received (address book) and supplies the addressing information to a geocoder (selected reference material source based upon the unique identifier). The geocoder generates a geocode corresponding to the addressing information and associates the geocode with the addressing information (Col. 3, lines 36-56; compare to Claim 19, *"... the request for information comprises a unique identifier associated with an entry in the address book, and wherein the reference engine selects the address book as the selected reference material source based upon the unique identifier"*). *")*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Courtner and Halstead providing the benefit of accessing data specific to a location over the web.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner in view of CC.

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Courtner fails to specifically teach *the request for information includes a selected word and a request for a definition of the word.* However, CC teaches a stand-alone application that works with all word processors. WordWorks is unique in that it includes a complete English dictionary with explanations, and so it can be used not only for finding alternative words, but also for spell checking and finding the meaning of words. Compare to Claim 15, *"... the request for information includes a selected word and a request for a definition of the word"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Courtner and CC providing the benefit of access to a dictionary from within any application.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtner in view of Abrams.

In regard to dependent Claims 21 and 22, Courtner fails to teach *the selected reference material source is one of a plurality of reference material sources, and at least one of the reference material sources is a remote server or the selected reference material source is accessed via a network.* However, Abrams teaches a means for

collecting summary information from remote sources, associating each summary item

(e.g., a reference item contained in a remote source web page) with a network address

(i.e., a URL) which describes where the full data item can be found (Col. 2, lines 53-58;

compare with Claim 21, *"... the selected reference material source is one of a*

plurality of reference material sources, and at least one of the reference material

sources is a remote server" and Claim 22, *"... the selected reference material*

source is accessed via a network"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Courtner and Abrams

providing the benefit of having had access to remote data sources.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CC in

view of Poirier et al. (hereinafter Poirier, U.S. Patent No. 6,321,372).

In regard to dependent Claim 26, CC does not specifically teach *selecting a*

dictionary file associated with a language specified by the language control. However,

Poirier teaches that once a language identifier has been obtained, the act in box (414)

obtains the request object's module type parameters and other specified parameters as

illustrated for request objects (352), (35), and (356) in Fig. 10. The act in box (414)

obtains a series of references of module objects indicated by the module type

parameters. Then the act in box (414) can call the associated method of each object in

the series, which in turn can call one of the linguistic modules (216) in accordance with

the identified language from box (410) or box (412) and in accordance with other

specified parameters from the request object. For example, if the request object is an

instance of dictionary lookup request object (354), the appropriate types of tokenizer, morphological analyzer, disambiguator, and dictionary lookup could be called to retrieve, for each word in the linguistic data, a counterpart word in the language indicated by the request language parameter (Col. 20, lines 29-44; compare to Claim 26, *"... the dictionary interface includes a language control and wherein selecting a dictionary file comprises: selecting a dictionary file associated with a language specified by the language control"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of CC and Poirier providing the benefit of selecting a language database.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

James H. Blackwell
05/11/04